PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (321) 373-3000

LLOYD K, GARRISON (1946-1991)

BANDOLPH E, PAUL (1946-1996)

BANDOLPH E, PAUL (1946-1

JEH C. JOHNSON BRAD S. KARP PATRICK N. KARSNITZ JOHN C. KENNEDY BRIAN KIM KYLE J. KIMPLER ALEXIA D. KORBERG ALAN W. KORNBERG

*NOT ADMITTED TO THE NEW YORK BAR *ADMITTED ONLY TO THE CALIFORNIA BAR

DANIEL J. KRAMER
BRIAN KRAUSE
CAITH KUSHNER
DARIO K. LAKHUFER
BRIAN C. LAVIN
SIAOYU GREG LIU
RANDY LUSKEY*+
LORETTA E. LYNCH
JEFFREY D. MARELL
MARCO V. MASOTTI
DAVID W MAYO
ELIZABETH R. MCCOLM
JEAN M. MCCOLM
JUDIE NG SHORTELL*
CATHERINE NYARADY
JANE B. O'BRIEN
BRAD R. OKUN
BRAD R. OKUN
BRAD R. OKUN
LINDSAY B. PARKS
ANDREW B. PARKS
JEFFREY J. RECHER
CARL L. REISNER
CARL L. REISNER
LORIN L. REISNER
LORIN L. REISNER
JEANNIE S. RHEEF
JEFFREY J. RECHER
JEFFREY J. RECHER
JEFFREY B. SAMUELS
KENNIETH M. SCHNEIDER
KONNIETH M. SCOTTUMER ELIZABETH M. SACKSTEDER
JEFFREY D. SAFERSTEIN
JEFFREY D. SAFERSTEIN
JEFFREY B. SAMUELS
KENNETH M. SCHWEIDER
BOHN M. SCOTUMER
OOHN M. STEVEN
SCOTT M. SONTAG
SARAH STASNY
TARUN M. STEVART
ELIZABETH TANNENBAUM
RICHARD C. TARLOWE
DAVID TARE
MONICA K. THURMOND
DANIEL J. TOAL
LAURA C. TURANO
CONRAD VAN LOGGERENBERG
MONICA K. THURMOND
DANIEL J. TOAL
LAURA C. TURANO
CONRAD VAN LOGGERENBERG
HERD W. VEIT
LIZA M. VELAZQUEZ
MICHAEL VOGEL
RAMY J. WAHBEH
JOHN WEBER
LAWRENCE G. WEE
THEODORE V. WELLS, JR.
LINDSEY L. WIERSMA
STEVEN J. WILLIAMS
LAWRENCE I. WITDORCHIC
MARK B. WILAZLO
DADAM WOLLSTEIN
JULIATARVER MASON WOOD
JENNIFER H. WU
BETTY VAP*
JORDAN E. YARETT
KAYE N. YOSHINO

BETTY YAP*
JORDAN E. YARETT
KAYE N. YOSHINO
TONG YU
TRACEY A. ZACCONE
TAURIE M. ZEITZER
T. ROBERT ZOCHOWSKI, JR.

United States Courthouse 40 Foley Square New York, NY 10007

> United States v. Neil Cole. Re: 19 Cr. 869 (ER)

Dear Judge Ramos:

We respectfully submit this letter on behalf of our client Neil Cole to request that the Court order the government to disclose the name of a witness who has provided the government with exculpatory evidence and who may have additional information helpful to the defense. For the reasons discussed below, the government's refusal to provide the defense with the identity of this anonymous witness is improper.

On July 3, 2021, the government notified the defense that, approximately two months earlier, the government interviewed an individual, referred to only as the "interviewee," who described a conversation that he or she had about the government's allegations with , a former member of the Board of Directors of Iconix. (Exhibit A.) According to the interviewee, during that conversation, stated. in substance and in part, that (Id.)

also stated to the interviewee that

(Id.)

Honorable Edgardo Ramos

2

After receiving the government's disclosure of exculpatory statements, we asked the government to provide the name of the "interviewee" who had witnessed those statements. The government refused, stating that "[t]he interviewee requested confidentiality." Although we attempted to accommodate the interviewee's request for confidentiality by contacting counsel directly, declined to speak with defense counsel.

On July 21, 2021, we informed the government that declined to speak with us and requested again that the government provide the name of the interviewee. Instead, the government provided defense counsel with the name of counsel who had been appointed to represent the interviewee, and again declined to identify the interviewee. We understand that the government first arranged for counsel to be appointed for the interviewee earlier that same day, even though the government itself spoke to the interviewee without counsel more than two months earlier. Appointed counsel told us that the interviewee did not wish to have the interviewee's identity known to others.

The statements made by , who served on the Iconix Board of Directors throughout the period relevant to the indictment and has more than 30 years of experience in the apparel industry, plainly are favorable and exculpatory as to Mr. Cole. The defense is entitled not only to the substance of statements, but also to the identities of individuals who witnessed those statements. In *United States* v. *Weigand*, for example, after the government disclosed to the defense potentially exculpatory statements, Judge Rakoff found that the government had failed to satisfy its disclosure obligations and therefore ordered the government to disclose, among other things, the identities of the individuals who witnessed the statements being made. 482 F. Supp. 3d 224, 248–49 (S.D.N.Y. 2020); *see also United States* v. *Ruiz*, 702 F. Supp. 1066, 1070 (S.D.N.Y. 1989) (ordering disclosure of "names and addresses of persons with relevant knowledge whom the government will not call as witnesses"), *aff'd*, 894 F.2d 501 (2d Cir. 1990).

The government's refusal to provide the identity of the interviewee is improper for similar reasons. It does not permit the defense to conduct its own investigation or make effective use of the exculpatory information, including by refreshing recollection, confronting him with prior inconsistent statements if necessary, and/or advancing our discussions with him on these issues by identifying the person with whom he had this exculpatory conversation.

Moreover, the interviewee's "request" for confidentiality is not a proper justification for withholding the interviewee's identity. This is not a circumstance, for example, where there is any plausible threat of violence to the interviewee. *Compare United States* v. *Urena*, 989 F. Supp. 2d 253, 263–64 (S.D.N.Y. 2013) (permitting government to keep witness's identity confidential because the witness reasonably feared retribution from defendants charged with violent crimes), *with United States* v.

Honorable Edgardo Ramos

3

Avendano, No. 02 CR. 1059 (LTS), 2003 WL 22454664, at *9 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 29, 2003) (ordering disclosure of alleged co-conspirators' identities where "there is nothing in the record to indicate that disclosing the requested information to Avendano would put the alleged co-conspirators in danger"), aff'd, 211 F. App'x 76 (2d Cir. 2007). And, even if there were some law enforcement interest in keeping this information confidential—and we are aware of none—that interest would not outweigh Mr. Cole's need for the information. See United States v. Jackson, 345 F.3d 59, 69–70 (2d Cir. 2003) (explaining that law enforcement interest in protecting the identity of a confidential informant must yield to a defendant's need for information that is helpful to the defense). "Fundamental requirements of fairness require" that the interviewee's request for confidentiality "must give way" to Mr. Cole's right to information that is "relevant and helpful to the defense." Id. (quoting Roviaro v. United States, 353 U.S. 53, 59–62 (1957)).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Court order the government to disclose to the defense immediately the names of the "interviewee" and any other witness present when made the exculpatory statements described in the government's July 3, 2021 disclosure.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Richard C. Tarlowe Richard C. Tarlowe